

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-15 are all the claims pending in the present application. Applicant thanks the Examiner for withdrawing the previous rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1-15 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beach et al (International Publication Number WO 01/47238) in view of Ranger (US Patent 5,999,940).

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicant previously argued that the applied references, either alone or in combination, neither teach nor suggest checking electronic program guides and search engine tables contained in broadcast signals received from at least one broadcasting company, as recited in claim 1. *See pages 6-7 of Amendment dated February 13, 2008.*

In response, the Examiner alleges:

Applicants argue "Beach neither teaches nor suggests checking electronic program guides and search engine tables contained in broadcast signals, as Beach discloses nothing about receiving broadcast data signals or search engine tables in the broadcast signals." Examiner respectfully disagrees. Beach teaches (Paragraph [018] Lines 16-21) a client unit that is in periodic contact with a server when this contact is made program information is downloaded from a vendor. Therefore this program information is going to be broadcasted from the vendor to the server so that the client can access it.

In response, Applicant submits that the Examiner cites the same portion of Beach as previously cited and substantially maintains the previous arguments. Applicant maintains that Beach neither teaches nor suggests checking electronic program guides and search engine tables contained in broadcast signals, as Beach discloses nothing about receiving broadcast data signals or search engine tables in the broadcast signals. Rather, Beach discloses that the client initiates communication with the server on a daily basis to download program guide data, with no

teaching or suggestion of broadcast data signals having search engine tables. *See* Beach, paragraph [0027]. Therefore, Beach neither teaches nor suggests checking electronic program guides and search engine tables contained in broadcast signals received from at least one broadcasting company, as downloading information at a client is different from receiving broadcast data signals or search engine tables in the broadcast signals.

Further, Applicant submits that neither of the applied references, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests composing a total electronic program guide and search engine table. *See page 8 of February 13 Amendment.*

In response, the Examiner alleges:

Applicants also argue "Beach neither teaches nor suggests composing a total electronic program guide and search engine table" Examiner respectfully disagrees. As Applicants point out the information database in Beach is indexed (Paragraphs [0036]-[0042]) and after it is indexed it can be searched for program information, therefore this index is in essence a search engine table).

In response, Applicant submits that the Examiner does not substantially augment her previous arguments. Accordingly, Applicant maintains that the cited portions of Beach refer to indexing a program information database, however Beach neither teaches nor suggests composing a search engine table, as the cited portions of Beach disclose nothing about a search engine table. Therefore, Beach neither teaches nor suggests composing a total electronic program guide and a search engine table.

Claims 2-15 are patentable at least by virtue of their indirect or direct dependencies from independent claim 1.

Further, in regards to claim 2, the Examiner yet again substantially maintains her previous arguments. That is, the Examiner maintains that Beach discloses that each of the search

engine tables is a list of a plurality of search engines which each of the broadcasting companies selects among existing search engines, because Beach allegedly discloses having various search options available. In response, Applicant maintains the previously submitted argument that simply disclosing different ways to search received program information does not disclose or suggest that each of the search engine tables is a list of a plurality of search engines. There is no mention of such a list in Beach.

Further, in regards to claim 3, the Examiner maintains that Beach (Fig. 2 and Paragraph [019]) discloses that the users can choose the type of search they would like to do and that each search would be done with different information and a different search engine. In response, Applicant submits that the Examiner yet again repeats the exact same arguments as previously submitted; accordingly, Applicant maintains that there is no teaching or suggestion of search engines being input into a search engine table from a user and registered to a search engine list

Further, with respect to claim 13, Applicant maintains the previously submitted arguments and respectfully points out that the Examiner does not respond to the previously submitted arguments with respect to claim 13.

At least based on the foregoing as well as the previously submitted arguments, Applicant submits that the combination of Beach and Ranger does not satisfy all the limitations of claims 1-15, and hence the combination of Beach and Ranger does not render claims 1-15 unpatentable.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116  
Application No.: 10/767,468

Attorney Docket No.: Q79411

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

  
Diallo T. Crenshaw  
Registration No. 52,778

Date: July 7, 2008